

**REMARKS**

The present Amendment has been prepared in response to the December 2, 2005 Office Action (Paper No. 20051129). By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 25 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-25 are pending in the application.

The title and claim 9 have been objected to and various claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for the reasons stated in sections 2-4 on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action.

By this Amendment, the entire application has been revised to correct minor informalities including those noted by the Examiner such that it is submitted that the application now meets all of the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 as to form.

The claims have been variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Kim are under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Kim in view of Higashinakawagawa et al. or obvious over Kim in view of Higashinakawagawa et al. and Kamide et al. for the reasons stated in sections 5 and 6 on pages 3-9 of the Office Action.

By this Amendment, the claims have been revised such that it is submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are patentable over the cited art, taken either alone or in combination, for the following reasons:

In all of the prior art rejections, the Examiner refers to a "mesh grid (54)" of Kim. However, element 54 of Kim is in fact a plurality of focus electrodes as noted in Figure 9 of Kim. Stated differently, element 54 of Kim corresponds to the focus electrode 52 of Figure 5 of the present application.

Furthermore, the focus electrodes 54 of Kim do not correspond to the recited mesh grid of the present claims in that the present claims now recite that the mesh grid including an effective screen portion having a plurality of beam passage holes arranged in a predetermined pattern and having an inactive portion absent any beam passage holes.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the independent claims, and by their dependency the remaining claims, recite a mesh grid neither taught nor suggested by Kim. Furthermore, since Kim does not teach or suggest the recited mesh grid of the present claims, and since all of the dependent claims are directed to feature on characteristics of the mesh grid, the dependent claims are further patentable over Kim.

As to the Examiner combining the features of Kim and Higashinakawagawa et al., it is noted that the shadow mask of Higashinakawagawa et al. does not correspond to the mesh grid of the present application nor does it add the features deficient in Kim.

Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion or incentive in either reference supporting the proposed combination since the mesh grid of the present invention does not correspond to the shadow mask of Higashinakawagawa et al.


Still furthermore, the Examiner has asserted that Kamide et al. teaches the use of a resistance layer in a field emitter for the purpose of decreasing the consumption of power of the display. However, the Examiner has not indicated the location of such a teaching and accordingly, such a teaching has not been found by the Applicant.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present claims are patentable over the cited art, taken either alone or in combination, and should therefore now be in a condition suitable for allowance.

No other issues remaining, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

No fee is incurred by this Amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Robert E. Bushnell,  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P57021  
Date: 2/28/06  
I.D.: REB/HMZ